

## **REMARKS**

### STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 16, 19, 22 and 25 are objected to due to informalities. The phrase "selected another translated" is not clear grammatical English. The claims are amended. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 11-12, 17, 20, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. (PGPUB 2005-0259319), in view of Kantrowitz et al. (PGPUB 2002-0156816).

Claims 1-10, 16, 19, 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,520) in view of Honda and in further view of Kantrowitz.

The pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter has been added.

### INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 16, 19, 22 and 25

Regarding claims 1 to 10, 16, 19, 22 and 25 (item 6 of the Office Action)

In the inventions according to these claims of the present application, the voice recognition unit selects a word matching input pronunciation, from among only those words that were selected as candidates for a word to be used in the translation of the original sentence but were not eventually used. In other words, the amended claims provide "obtaining a plurality of translated words respectively corresponding to words composing an input original sentence from a translated word dictionary file" (claim 1). Further, in contrast to Lee, Honda and Kantrowitz, the amended claims provide a benefit of further correcting the translation, namely "a speech recognition unit recognizing an input speech pronunciation and selecting another~~other~~ translated word matching the input~~inputted~~ pronunciation, ~~from the plurality of translated words except for the translated word selected by the translation unit~~among the translated words obtained by the translated word obtaining unit excepting for the translated word selected by the translation unit, and outputting the ~~selected another~~other translated word as a result of the speech recognition"

(claim 1). And based upon the speech recognition, “correcting the translated sentence translated by the translation unit by using the ~~selected another~~other translated word ~~outputted~~output from the speech recognition unit” (claim 1). For example, the present application FIG. 3B, operation S112 and operations S122-126 and page 23, line 21 to page 25, line 24 support the claims.

Further, this configuration has a benefit of improving the accuracy of recognizing pronunciation, because the range of selection by the speech recognizer is limited to include only the translated words that were selected at some previous time as candidates to be used for the translated sentences but were ultimately not used for the translated sentences.

Nothing has been found or cited expressly or implicitly in Lee, Honda, and Kantrowitz to support a prima facie case of obviousness, namely that one skilled in the art would combine Lee’s recognition of input speech for translation of arbitrary sentences of mandarin speech into corresponding Chinese character with Honda’s conversion-result correction portion 29 that evaluates output language and with Kantrowitz machine translation application in which the user corrects translation errors that are provided to the translation engine to improve the engine and allow the learning of additional translation rules, and further combined Lee, Honda and Kantrowitz to provide the claimed “translating an inputted~~the~~ original sentence into a translated sentence by selecting ~~each~~a translated word to be used in the translated sentence from the plurality of translated words obtained by the translated word obtaining unit” and “recognizing an input speech pronunciation and selecting another~~other~~ translated word matching the input~~inputted~~ pronunciation, ~~from the plurality of translated words except for the translated word selected by the translation unit~~among the translated words obtained by the translated word obtaining unit excepting for the translated word selected by the translation unit, and outputting the ~~selected another~~other translated word as a result of the speech recognition” (claim 1).

The Office Action relies upon Honda’s conversion-result correction portion 29, FIG. 20, paragraphs 173-176 and 198-207, however, Honda’s conversion-result correction portion 29 sends a request signal, as the feedback information, to the speech recognizer, and nothing has been found or cited expressly or implicitly that one skilled in the art would modify Honda’s conversion-result correction portion 29 to achieve the claimed “recognizing an input speech pronunciation and selecting another~~other~~ translated word matching the input~~inputted~~ pronunciation, ~~from the plurality of translated words except for the translated word selected by the translation unit~~among the translated words obtained by the translated word obtaining unit

excepting for the translated word selected by the translation unit, and outputting the selected  
another~~other~~ translated word as a result of the speech recognition.”

#### INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 11, 17, 20, 23 and 26

Regarding claims 11 to 12, 17, 20, 23 and 26 (item 5 of the Office Action), cited document Kantrowitz (US•2002/0156816) that is newly cited in the outstanding Office Action discloses a computer assisted method of learning user operations to a text in a document. The Office Action points out that Kantrowitz discloses a document translation that is not disclosed in cited Honda. However, in contrast to Honda, the language of these claims provides that a correction unit re-translates the whole original sentence, when a part of speech of a translated word is not correct, namely “a part of speech determination unit determining whether a part of speech of the other translated word differs from a part of speech of the translated word to be replaced with the other translated word” and “re-translating the whole original sentence in order to correct~~correcting~~ the translated sentence, by using the ~~inputted another~~other translated word that has been inputted into the translated word input unitword, if a according to the part of speech determination the part of speech of the~~inputted another~~other translated word differs from a~~the~~ part of speech of the translated word to be replaced with the ~~inputted another~~other translated word.”

For example, the present application FIG. 6 and page 37, line 15 to page 40, line 6 support these claims. Honda’s conversion-result correction portion 29 sends a request signal, as the feedback information, to the speech recognizer. So nothing has been found or cited, expressly or implicitly, that one skilled in the art would combine Honda and Kantrowitz and then further modify Honda’s conversion-result correction portion 29 to provide this claimed feature and seen the benefit of further correcting a translation, including for example, a translation further corrected with other translated word based upon voice recognition as in claim 1, based upon a difference in the part of speech including the translated word and the part of speech after the correction using the other translated word.

Other claims require similar limitations and are allowable for similar rationale. Allowance of the claims is requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: September 19, 2008

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mehdi D. Sheikerz  
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501